



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Court in *Taylor vs. Nichols et al.*, 29 Vt. 104, to the effect that this requirement of the official oath is mere form, and should be regarded as directory merely. The action was on a receipt given by the defendants to the plaintiff as sheriff, and the defence was that the sheriff never gave any legal recognisance as such, and therefore never became legally sheriff. The Court inclined to consider the recognisance itself valid, but held, that whether so or not, as the plaintiff was a good officer *de facto*, and the attachment, therefore, legal between the parties, and as this suit was merely to enforce the attachment for the benefit of the creditor, the action could be maintained. It does not appear from the case that any question arose as to the plaintiff having taken the oath of office, and what was said on this point by the learned judge was merely by way of illustration, and probably without particular examination of the precise point involved in his observation.

The judgment of the County Court is reversed, and judgment rendered for the plaintiff for the damages assessed by the County Court.

In the District Court of the United States for the District of Wisconsin.

THE UNITED STATES vs. THE PROPELLER "SUN."

1. A vessel propelled in whole or in part by steam, is not liable to a penalty for transporting goods, wares and merchandise, without inspection of the hull and boilers, under the act of Congress of August 30, 1852. The penalty is alone for transporting passengers.
 2. An answer to a libel of information must be full and explicit to each article. It must deny the charges, or confess and avoid them by proper averments of facts.
- Quere.*—Can a vessel belonging at the port of Buffalo, where inspectors are located by the act of August 30, 1852, be inspected at the port of Chicago?

The opinion of the Court was delivered by

MILLER, J.—By the information this propeller was seized by the Collector at the port of Milwaukee, on the 6th of October, 1861, for the following causes:

1st. That on the 20th of September, 1861, the propeller did transport goods and passengers from Milwaukee to Goderich, in Canada, without first having complied with an act of Congress, approved July 7, 1838, entitled "an act to provide for the better security of the lives of passengers on board of vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam," and the act of August 30, 1852, entitled "an act to amend an act," &c., in this, that the hull of said propeller had not been inspected pursuant to the provisions of the ninth section of the last act within one year prior to the 20th of September, 1861. For each of said violations a penalty of five hundred dollars is claimed.

2d. That on the 28th of September, 1861, the vessel did transport goods and passengers from the port of Goderich to the port of Milwaukee, without inspection of her boilers, and for each violation of the act a penalty of five hundred dollars is claimed.

Respondent answers, that the vessel was licensed at Buffalo, and was employed in the business of commerce and navigation between the ports of Chicago and Milwaukee, on lake Michigan, and the port of Goderich, in Canada. That the hull and boilers of the vessel were inspected at the port of Chicago, and certificate issued on the 19th of September, 1860, and on the 8th of September, 1861, before the certificate had expired, respondent caused an application to be made to the inspectors at Chicago, for the inspection of the hull and boilers of the propeller; and on the 28th of the same month a second application was made.

At the time of the first application the inspectors were absent from Chicago, and at the time of making the second application the inspectors had not the pumps and necessary machinery for making the inspection, and that one of the inspectors was then absent. The propeller was inspected at Chicago on the 8th of October following, when a certificate was issued by the inspectors; and there are no local inspectors on lakes Huron and Michigan.

To the answer, the District Attorney filed exceptions: That respondent had not fully and distinctly answered the libel, and the matters set forth are immaterial and irrelevant.

Before considering the exceptions, it may be proper to inquire

what the respondent should answer to. The libel is intended to charge that the propeller is liable to a penalty of five hundred dollars, for carrying goods, &c., and a like penalty for carrying passengers from Milwaukee to Goderich, and similar penalties for carrying goods and passengers from Goderich to Milwaukee, without having been first inspected, as required by the acts of July 7, 1838, and August 30, 1852.

The act of July 7, 1838, 5 Statutes, 304, entitled "an act to provide for the better security of the lives of passengers on board of vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam," directs in section 2: "that it shall not be lawful for the owner, master, or captain of any steamboat, or vessel propelled in whole or in part by steam, to transport any goods, wares or merchandise, or passengers, in or upon the bays, lakes, rivers, or other navigable waters of the United States, without having first obtained from the proper officer a license under the existing laws, and without having complied with the conditions imposed by this act; and for each violation of this section the owners of said vessel shall forfeit and pay to the United States the sum of five hundred dollars, the one-half to the use of the informer, and for which sum or sums the steamboat or vessel so engaged shall be liable, and may be seized and proceeded against summarily, by way of libel, in any District Court of the United States having jurisdiction of the offence." The act then directs the appointment and duties of inspectors of hulls and boilers of such boats and vessels.

The act approved August 30, 1852, 10 Statutes, 61, is an act to amend the act of July, 1838. The first section directs: "That no license, registry, or enrolment under the provisions of this or the act to which this is an amendment, shall be granted, or other papers issued by any collector to any vessel propelled in whole or in part by steam, and carrying passengers, until he shall have satisfactory evidence that all the provisions of this act have been fully complied with; and if any such vessel shall be navigated, with passengers on board, without complying with the terms of this act, the owners thereof and the vessel itself shall be subject to the penalties contained in the second section of the act to which

this is an amendment." The whole object and scope of the last act was to provide for the better security of the lives of passengers, and it provides a full and perfect system for the inspection of the hulls and boilers of vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam, and carrying passengers. By the section of the act above quoted, the penalty prescribed in the second section of the act of July, 1838, is continued as to vessels navigated with passengers on board, without complying with the terms of the act in regard to inspection. The penalty in the act of July, 1838, for transporting goods, wares, and merchandise on vessels not inspected, is not embraced in the act of August, 1852; and by this last act all parts of laws heretofore passed, which are suspended by, or inconsistent with the act, are repealed. That provision in the act of July, 1838, was outside of the object of the act, and in the subsequent act it is entirely omitted. In this respect the two acts are inconsistent, and the provision of the last act must prevail. This is a penal statute, and it must be construed literally. The respondent is not required to answer that part of the libel, of information claiming a penalty for transporting on this propeller, goods, wares, or merchandise, without previous inspection of her hull and boilers.

The exceptions to the answer will have to be allowed.

The answer neither denies nor confesses the charges. The respondent must fully and explicitly answer the several articles of the libel. He must deny the several articles, or confess and avoid them by a proper allegation of facts.

By the answer, the propeller was licensed at the port of Buffalo Creek, on the 5th of April, 1861. There is no allegation that since then she has been transferred to any other port. It is also alleged that her hull and boilers were inspected at the port of Chicago, on the 19th of September, 1860; and that before the certificate expired, and again on the 28th of September, 1861, application was made to the inspectors at Chicago for inspection, which was not done for the reasons stated. It is not alleged that the application was in writing, as the law requires; nor does it appear that the inspectors at Chicago had any official right to

perform the duty. By section 9 of the act of August, 1852, inspectors were directed to be appointed at Buffalo, which was the port where this propeller belonged. The inspectors are to perform the services required of them by the act, within the respective districts for which they shall be appointed; and by the twelfth specification of the section, the Board, when thereto requested, shall inspect steamers belonging to districts where no such Board is established. If this propeller belongs at the port of Buffalo Creek, it is questionable whether a certificate of inspection at the port of Chicago should be adjudged a compliance with the law. But this subject can be more maturely examined hereafter.

THE UNITED STATES *vs.* THE STEAMBOAT "SENECA."

A steamboat employed in transporting passengers between ports in the same State, is not liable to a penalty for not having the hull and boilers inspected under the act of Congress of August 30, 1852, and the District Court has no jurisdiction.

The opinion of the Court was delivered by

MILLER, J.—It is propounded in the information, that at the port of Superior, on Lake Superior, in this District, the Collector of Customs for the Collection District of Michilimackinac, did seize said steamboat and now holds her in his custody within this District, as forfeited to the United States for carrying and transporting goods and passengers between the ports of Superior and Bayfield, on Lake Superior, within this State, without license and the inspection of her hull and boilers required by the Acts of Congress of July 7th, 1838, and August 30th, 1852, and in violation of those acts.

By the information, this steamboat was engaged exclusively in transporting passengers and property between the ports mentioned in the information, which are located on Lake Superior, and within the State of Wisconsin.

It is well settled that the constitutional power of Congress "to